In 1912, Juliette Gordon Low founded the first Girl Scout troop, with 18 girls, in Savannah, Georgia. 106 years later, more than 50 million women are Girl Scout alums, and the program reaches nearly 2 million girls. Today, Girl Scout alums launch rockets into space, serve as CEOs of international companies, sit on academic boards, and more.

As we celebrate the Girl Scouts' 106th birthday this week and Women's History Month, I applaud the Girl Scout councils that serve girls in my State for building girls of courage, confidence, and character, who make the world a better place.

I am proud that this program was founded in the First Congressional District of Georgia and in my hometown of Savannah, Georgia.

TERMINALLY ILL PATIENTS DESERVE THE RIGHT TO TRY

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my displeasure that the House was unable to pass the Right to Try Act this week. This bill would have allowed very sick or terminally ill patients to request access to drugs and treatments that have yet to be approved by the FDA.

For any patient dealing with a serious, life-threatening illness, a sliver of hope can go a long way. Yet, for some reason, even after the Senate, of all places, passed this proposal nearly unanimously, some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle blocked this measure from passing.

Sick patients deserve the right to utilize every possible tool at their disposal, even if it is still experimental. The government really has no business telling a terminally ill patient they cannot pursue a certain avenue of treatment, and, as its name suggests, this legislation gives them the right to try.

I thank Mr. RUTHERFORD for his work on this legislation. I urge the House to bring this back to the floor and pass it as quickly as possible.

THE PARALYSIS THAT BESETS THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to share some thoughts with you during this Special Order hour at the request of the minority leader.

I am a professor of constitutional law, as those of you who watch our proceedings here may know by now, and I would like to talk about the Constitution, and I will get there before this is over.

But I want to start, Mr. Speaker, with a basic question of political science, which is: Why does it seem as if it is so hard for us to get the people's business done in Congress these days?

Why does it seem so difficult that, even when we have a vast consensus on what to do about a particular issue, we still can't get it done?

Why is it that the approval rating of our institution, according to the most recent Rasmussen poll, is at 15 percent, which I think most people would agree is a pretty dismal showing for the people's Congress and here in the people's House.

Well, I want to talk about this problem in some historical and constitutional perspective, and I hope that it opens up some roots of thinking and feeling that might enable us to transcend some of the paralysis that now besets the United States Congress.

Of course, the simple explanation that is often given colloquially is that everybody in Washington is just fighting, and you have got the two parties at each others' throats, and everybody is so divided that nothing happens.

This explanation, although it turns out to be wrong, of course, has a long lineage to it. In fact, the Founders wrote very widely at the time our Constitution was adopted about the problem of faction, and they said, if you look at James Madison in Federalist No. 10, for example, he identifies faction as the central problem in the political life of a democracy. But he says that the latent causes of faction are sewn in the nature of man, and we see them everywhere.

Madison cites a zeal for different opinions concerning religion, concerning government, and many other points, as well as speculation as a practice. He cites, also, an attachment to different leaders ambitiously contending for preeminence and power; and he invokes the human passions that have divided mankind into parties, inflaming them with mutual animosity.

So strong is this propensity of mankind to fall into mutual animosities, Madison writes, ''that where no substantial occasion presents itself, the most frivolous and fanciful distinctions have been sufficient to kindle their unfriendly passions and incite their most violent conflicts.''

□ 1645

In other words, even when there is not something real and big to be fighting about, people will find something small, trivial, and petulant to fight about. And those of you with little brothers and sisters might agree that is just the way it is. Sometimes it is in human nature for people to fight.

But the Founders understood that faction was something that would arise in a democratic society where people have the liberty of thought and expression. In fact, Madison said one of the ways that you could deal with the problem of faction is to destroy the liberty that gives rise to faction, but that, of course, plunges us into authoritarianism, monarchy dictatorship. One way you get rid of all the different views is you go to one party. You create a one-party state like they have got in North Korea, and then there is no conflicts because everybody does what the one party says.

So Madison dismisses that and says that is not going to work. We are not going to be able to remove the sources of faction, but why don't we try to control the effects of faction. And the way you do that, he said, is that if—in order to control the effects of a majority tyranny is you have a bill of rights that defends the rights of the minority so that people in the majority can implement their policy preferences, but they can't extinguish the rights of the minority, the right to speak, the right of press, the right to dissent, the right to vote, and so on.

But also, Madison said, if you extend the size of the republic, if you create a big country, then even if you get a majority on one particular issue, the majorities are shifting because then you will have a different majority on another issue and a different majority on another issue and so on.

But what happens, he says, if you have a faction that is tyrannizing the society, but it is not a majority faction, it is a minority faction? What if you have a small group that is able to hijack the process and prevent the majority from having its way? Well, he thought, there, democratic processes and Republican government would take care of it.

He says this: ''If a faction consists of less than a majority''—a minority of people—''relief is supplied by the republican principle, which enables the majority to defeat its sinister views by regular vote.''

The minority ''may clog the administration, it may convulse the society, but it will be unable to execute and mask its violence under the forms of the Constitution.''

In other words, Madison is assuming that, when it comes to public policy, the majority will eventually get its way if the governmental process is working correctly.

Now, let's fast-forward to 2018. I am taking three issues where the vast majority of the American people agree as to what should be done to deal with this serious, serious public policy problem.

Let's start with the problem of high prescription drug prices. Now, Congress passed a law saying that the government could not negotiate for lower prescription drug prices in the Medicare program with the big pharmaceutical companies, and it will not surprise you to learn that the big pharmaceutical companies who invest a lot of money and campaign contributions also paid for a lot of lobbyists to go and lobby for that provision to be put into the law.

So the Federal Government can negotiate for lower prescription drug prices